

Application No. 09/411,212

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of May 20, 2003, Applicant has carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicant believes that the claims remain allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In this Office Action of May 20, 2003, Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dermer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,313,570, (hereinafter Dermer) in view of Fukuda et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,867,593 (hereinafter Fukuda). The Examiner acknowledges that Dermer does not disclose modeling a third image wherein the third image contains at least said first and second images and represents a depiction of said first and second images without an overlap between said first and second images. Fukuda is proffered as supplying what Dermer lacks. However, the teaching supplied by Fukuda provides for an output of only the three separate image regions A' and B', as well as region H, as discussed with regards to Figures 24A to 24C. (Please see in particular column 22, lines 48-50). There is no suggestion or teaching in Fukuda to provide in combination a new (third) image consisting of (in effect for Fukuda), the image regions A' and B' in combination, but without the overlap region H, as is claimed by the Applicants. That is because Fukuda is only interested in decreasing the number of regions for image load discrimination (see column 22 lines 51-54). That interest is in contrast to Applicant's interest in delineating amongst a plethora of documents, snapshots, etc. all laid upon a smart platen for simultaneous input with a single scan. Thus, Fukuda does not have any reason to teach or suggest, modeling a third image wherein the third image contains at least said first and second images and represents a depiction of said first and second images without an overlap between said first and second images. Indeed, nowhere within Fukuda is there to be found any such teaching

Application No. 09/411,212

or suggestion. Thereby, Fukuda fails to provide what Dermer lacks. Thus, there is no motivation for anyone skilled in the art to combine Dermer and Fukuda. Thus a showing for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 1 and 9 are therefore allowable as they stand. Allowance of claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Dermer does not teach bin lists. Dermer teaches the compensation for mis-registration of printing plates by determining the boundaries between regions of color. As such Dermer operates upon structured graphic image data (see column 4, lines 45-47) one example of which is "PostScript" ® (see column 4, line 60). A structured graphic image by definition provides regions to be filled (see column 4, line 54) or a graphic object description which refers to a single closed polygon (see column 4, lines 67-68). The graphic object description for each such polygon is made up of the *coordinates of all the vertices* which define the closed polygon (see column 5, lines 5-8). A collection of all such graphic object descriptions as an entire set makes up a display list. When a display list is "clipped" (see column 5, lines 34-39) the set of boundaries collected together is referred to as a boundary map. The Figure 12 referenced in the Office Action is a depiction of such a boundary map and as such depicts *coordinates of all the vertices* which define that closed polygon. It is these *coordinates of all the vertices* and the lines they define which are listed in tables 1-3 also referenced in the Office Action. None of the above are analogous to a bin list.

A bin list is a list of edge points (i.e. pixel points) that are approximately collinear, wherein an edge occurs in an image when two neighboring pixels have sufficiently different pixel values according to an appropriate criterion for the occurrence of an edge between them. (See page 7, lines 15-17 and page 8, lines 13-17). As will be apparent to one skilled in the art, these edge pixels are such as is found in bit mapped image data. This is in stark

Application No. 09/411,212

contrast to the structured graphic image data of Dermer and the polygon edges as defined by coordinate vertices described therein. A polygon edge needs but two coordinate vertices to describe it. The determination of an edge in bitmapped data will require a great many edge points to define it. Dermer teaches structured graphic image data and polygon edges as defined by coordinate vertices. The Applicant teaches bitmapped data as would be available from a scanner and the collection of pixel edge points to define an edge. Thus, Dermer fails to teach the Applicant's utilization of bin lists as first approximations of where these boundaries are when confused by a picture/document background similar to a platen background as will be evident to anyone skilled in the art. Thus a showing for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 1 and 9 are therefore allowable as they stand. Allowance of claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, and 16 as being unpatentable over combined teachings of Dermer, and Fukuda. As claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, and 16, depend from claims deemed allowable, they should be allowable as well. Allowance of claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, and 16 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner appears to have considered various portions of the references cited, in each instance viewing the cited portion in isolation from the context of the entire reference, and combined these isolated portions to arrive at the present invention with the benefit of hindsight. Using hindsight or applying the benefit of the teachings of the present application when determining obviousness, however, is impermissible; the references applied must be reviewed without hindsight, must be reviewed as a whole, and must suggest the desirability of combining the references.

Application No. 09/411,212

It is respectfully submitted that the present set of claims are patentably distinct over the cited references. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher D. Wait  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 43,230  
Telephone (585) 423-6918

August 20, 2003  
CDW/fsl  
Xerox Corporation  
Xerox Square 20A  
Rochester, New York 14644

**OFFICIAL**

**FAX RECEIVED**

**AUG 20 2003**

**GROUP 2600**